

-6-

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on November 26, 2007, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-20 are pending in this Application. . Claims 1, 12 and 17 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. In this Amendment, claim 19 has been amended. Applicants believe that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,737,330 to Fulthorp et al. (hereinafter Fulthorp) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,159 to Shorey (hereinafter Shorey). Fulthorp teaches a system and method for the efficient control of a radio communications network. The Examiner stated that Fulthorp teaches the use of a temporal offset for a temporal period at column 2, lines 63-67. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion. A careful review of Fulthorp discloses each of a plurality of remote radio units that transmit a poll request to a base station. The base station then transmit a poll signal which includes a poll response sequence which indicates a time frame in which a radio unit may respond to the poll signal. Thus, Fulthorp arguably discloses receiving a polling request that specifies a first temporal period for a plurality of expected future transmissions. Fulthorp does not disclose or suggest estimating a first temporal offset for a wake-up schedule.

In contrast to Fulthorp, claim 1 recites receiving a temporal period and a when the temporal period cannot be accommodated, then determining a temporal offset for a wake-up schedule. As stated in the specification as filed at paragraph 46, the temporal offset is used to keep the rate of collisions between the new wake-up schedule and existing schedules below a threshold value. Accordingly, since Fulthorp fails to disclose or suggest the use of a temporal offset with a wake up schedule claim 1 is believed allowable over Fulthorp. Claims 12 and 17 contain similar language regarding a temporal offset for a wake-up schedule, and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as

-7-

claim 1. Claims 3-11, 13-16 and 18-20 depend from claim 1, 12 or 17 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Claim 19 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fulthorp in view of Shorey and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7068992 to Massie (hereinafter Massie). Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is believed allowable as it depends from a base claim which is believed allowable.

If the Examiner is to maintain any of the above rejections, he is asked to point out in particular detail where in the prior art the use of a temporal offset is used in conjunction with a wake-up schedule.

In view of the above the Examiners' rejections are believed to have been overcome, placing the pending claims in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants hereby petitions for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

-8-

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/DWR/

David W. Rouille, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 40,150
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive, Suite 280
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: AVA04-08

Dated: May 27, 2008